USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

NATO TRANSFORMATION:
FINDING RELEVANCE IN COPING WITH
THE ASYMMETRIC THREAT OF TERRORISM

by

Colonel Steward E. Remaly
United States Army

Colonel Alan G. Stolberg
Project Advisor

Report Documentation Page		*Form Approved* *OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE **03 MAY 2004**	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED **-**	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **NATO Transformation: Finding Relevance in Coping with the Asymmetric Threat of Terrorism**		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
		5b. GRANT NUMBER	
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) **Steward Remaly**		5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
		5e. TASK NUMBER	
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **U.S. Army War College,Carlisle Barracks,Carlisle,PA,17013-5050**		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT **Approved for public release; distribution unlimited**
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES
14. ABSTRACT **See attached file.**
15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES **30**	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**			

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Steward E. Remaly

TITLE: NATO Transformation: Finding Relevance in Coping with the Asymmetric Threat of Terrorism

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 19 March 2004 PAGES: 30 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

   The time is now for the United States and NATO to mend any political fences and move toward strengthening this historic alliance.   Throughout NATO's history the solidarity of the alliance has always been more important than the concern of any single country. The transatlantic community is facing new asymmetric threats that will require all collective means available to defeat them. In order for the alliance to succeed and protect its interests, to include U.S. interests, the U.S. must dedicate significant attention to the alliance and support its transformation to a force capable of winning the Global War on Terrorism.

   This paper examines the challenges NATO will face as it begins to transform its organization and force. These challenges include how to restructure the force to make it more agile and relevant, the impact that the European Security Defense Initiative (ESDI) have on NATO transformation, the impact of the ongoing U.S. military transformation on NATO, and whether NATO can incorporate U.S. initiatives and gain better interoperability with U.S. forces.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NATO TRANSFORMATION: FINDING RELEVANCE IN COPING WITH THE ASYMMETRIC THREAT OF TERRORISM

It could be said that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has a greater stake in transformation of the force than the United States. The widening gap between U.S. capabilities and NATO capabilities has almost rendered the alliance useless as a military power or deterrent. In the past 12 years, three regional wars have demanded a collective response; yet the alliance as an institution has been slow to react and fully support operations. Political disagreements over intervention in certain conflicts and the lack of military capability were factors that effected NATO decisions and have led the call for change.

The new asymmetric threats of global terrorism and the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) will require an even greater commitment for change within the alliance. The lack of a modernized military, coupled with the rapid advances made by the U.S. in technology and doctrine has accelerated the danger of NATO's perceived irrelevancy. [1]

Over the course of the last 10 years NATO has embarked on numerous efforts to change the face of the alliance to include making it look more European. This strategy of enlargement has in some cases exacerbated NATO efforts to transform its military capability. The acceptance of new members from the former Warsaw Pact has burdened the alliance with additional readiness and interoperability problems. Since its inception the alliance has struggled with the challenge of interoperability and compatibility with even the oldest of allies. During the more recent conflicts such as Kosovo and Afghanistan member states experienced numerous communication and interoperability problems. In addition NATO has been slow moving and indecisive when committing to support outside the European community.

Adding to the question of NATO's relevancy is the growing divide in defense spending between NATO countries and the United States. The United States spends over $300bn on defense, with the probability of increasing to over $400bn, while the other members of the NATO alliance only spend $150bn and is in decline. In addition rapid advances in command, control communication, computing, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR), precision guided munitions (PGMs) and new sensors, munitions, tactical aircraft and other weapons systems have increased the disparity in capabilities within the alliance.[2]

The new U.S. defense strategy requires the American force to be smaller, more lethal, and joint in order to fight it's way into a crisis zone and swiftly defeat new asymmetric threats. Right now the U.S. can deploy to contingency areas almost 3 times faster and strike more lethally than its allies.[3] In order to meet the new challenges brought on by the asymmetric threat of global terrorism and proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), the U.S. has

embarked on a rapid transformation of the force. This transformation which is based on joint interdependence and using network centric warfare is adding to the risk of NATO and U.S. being incapable of fighting together.

So what must NATO do to stem the tide of losing its relevancy as the worlds benchmark alliance? How can NATO transform to meet the challenges of the new threat? This paper will attempt to identify the challenges of transformation and lay out a strategy for NATO to maintain its relevancy as an alliance.   Key in this strategy is to define transformation for both the U. S. and NATO.   In addition it is important to look at what transformational changes NATO has made in the past and how effective those changes have been.   A look at current operations in Afghanistan will also help identify those key areas that NATO must continue to improve upon in order to maintain its push towards transformation. This paper concludes with identifying the risks for NATO as it embarks on its course of transformation.

DEFINING TRANSFORMATION

> The need for transformation was clear before the war in Afghanistan and before September 11th…What's different today is our sense of urgency-the need to build this future force while fighting a present war. It's like overhauling an engine when you are going at 80 miles an hour. Yet we have no other choice.

> —President George W. Bush at the Citidel, Dec 11 2001

> Some believe that with the United States in the midst of a dangerous war on terrorism, now is not the time to transform our armed forces. I believe the opposite is true. Now is precisely the time to make changes. The war on terrorism is a transformational event that cries out for us to rethink our activities, and to put that new thinking into action."

> —Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld,
> Defense Transformation Planning Guidance, April 2003

DEFINING TRANSFORMATION FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Since September 11th transformation has been the center of attention of the United States Department of Defense and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).   The Global War on Terrorism has brought to light a new asymmetrical threat that requires transforming the way we think, plan, and fight this new global threat.   This threat does not recognize boundaries and is set against destroying the fabric of democratic freedom throughout the world.   In order to defeat this threat it will be critical for all free and democratic nations to ally themselves with others that respect and promote the principles of freedom and democracy.

In recognizing this, the leaders of the U.S. and NATO have set a course of trying to rapidly transform the fighting force to deal with this new threat.   The United States strategy for

transformation is defined in the April 2003 Transformation Planning Guidance and in the recently released publication from the Office of Defense Transformation, titled "Military Transformation: A Strategic Approach."[4]

According to these key documents, transformation is defined as " a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nations advantages and protect against our asymmetric vulnerabilities to sustain our strategic position which helps underpin peace and stability in the world."[5] In addition to this definition the Commander of the Allied Command for Transformation, Admiral Giambastiani, defines transformation as bringing changes to doctrine, organization, capabilities, training, education and logistics. "It is not just about new weapon systems and improving capabilities. It is understood that Transformation is a process and a mind-set. It is an iterative, ongoing process that seeks to adapt and master unexpected challenges in a very dynamic environment. It is about managing the future in a joint and combined way." Most would agree that transformation is a process that is all about changing the way we fight by adapting new technologies, developing advanced war fighting concepts and then integrating the two in a decisive manner[6].

Arguably, for the United States, Transformation has been taking place for almost a decade, with a more rapid acceleration since 9/11. Operation DESERT STORM demonstrated the value of Stealth technology, precision weapons and advances in night vision technology. After the first Gulf War the U.S. saw a need to meld technological advances with doctrine to move from a force that operated using joint deconfliction to one which could practice joint interoperability. Over the past decade advances in stealth technology, ISR, PGM, C2, increased lift capability with C-17 and Roll On Roll Off Ships, and improved logistical support have resulted in the U. S. fielding joint forces capable of achieving interoperability. These initial transformational steps were instrumental in defeating both the Taliban and Iraqi Army, and disrupting the Al Qaeda terror network.

The strategy for defense transformation is a vital component of the United States defense strategy. At its core is a strategy for large-scale innovation. More specifically, transformation strategy is about how a competitive space is selected within which U.S. forces can gain an important advantage. The strategy identifies the attributes within that space that will ultimately lead to an advantage for U.S. forces, not only during combat operations, but also in the conduct of all missions across the full range of operations.[7]

According to Director for the Office of Transformation, retired Vice Admiral Cebrowski, the Defense Department's transformation must address three major areas: how we do business

inside the Department, how we work with our interagency and multinational partners, and how we fight. The transformation process must develop forces capable of defending the U.S. population, homeland, and interests, as well as swiftly defeating an adversary from a posture of forward deterrence with minimal reinforcements. No aspect of defense should be left untouched if we are to maintain a competitive advantage in the information age.[8]

Although U.S. military forces today enjoy significant advantages in many aspects of armed conflict, the United States will be challenged by threat forces that possess or seek capabilities and design novel concepts to overcome our advantages. The trends that will provide adversaries with capabilities and opportunities to do harm to the United States include: diminishing protection afforded by geographic distance, the emergence of regional threats, growing asymmetric threats, and increasing threats from weakened states and ungoverned areas.[9]

The Department's military transformation efforts must be focused on emerging strategic and operational challenges and the opportunities created by these challenges.   Six critical operational goals identified by Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld provide the focus for the Department's transformation efforts: (1) Protecting critical bases and defeating chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons; (2) Projecting and sustaining forces in anti-access environments; (3) Denying enemy sanctuary; (4) Leveraging information technology; (5) Assuring information systems and conducting information operations; and (6) Enhancing space capabilities. Over time, the continued focus of the Department's force transformation efforts on the development of the capabilities necessary to achieve these six critical operational goals will help shift the balance of U.S. forces and broaden capabilities.[10]

In addition to these six goals U.S. transformation strategy will be anchored by four military transformation pillars.   As outlined in the Defense Transformation Planning Guidance, four military transformation pillars are identified: strengthening joint operations, exploiting U.S. intelligence advantages, concept development and experimentation, and developing transformational capabilities.   These concepts constitute the essential elements of the Department's force transformation strategy.   The first pillar focuses on strengthening joint operations through the development of joint concepts and architectures and the pursuit of other important joint initiatives and interoperability goals. The second pillar involves exploiting U.S. intelligence advantages through multiple intelligence collection assets, global surveillance and reconnaissance, and enhanced exploitation and dissemination. The new security environment requires unprecedented intelligence capabilities to anticipate where, when, and how adversaries intend to harm the United States.   The third pillar, concept development and experimentation,

concerns experimentation with new approaches to warfare, operational concepts and capabilities, and organizational constructs through war gaming, simulations, and field exercises focused on emerging challenges and opportunities.[11] The Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) in concert with the Allied Command for Transformation (ACT) will oversee experiments designed to evaluate new concepts and provide results that help refine those concepts and develop the mechanisms for implementing change.

Although the transformation of the U.S. Armed Forces is a continuing process, the recent performance of U.S. and coalition forces in the successful conduct of Operations ENDURING FREEDOM and IRAQI FREEDOM has provided a glimpse of the future potential for the emerging way of war. The advances of the emerging way of war made in C4ISR, constructed around the fundamental tenets of network-centric warfare, and emphasizing high-quality shared awareness, dispersed forces, speed of command, and flexibility in planning and execution, will result in U.S. forces conducting powerful effects-based operations to achieve strategic, operational, and tactical objectives across the full spectrum of military operations.[12] The US will also be required to engage in these processes with NATO in order for the alliance to maintain its relevancy and continue to promote its own transformation.

DEFINING TRANSFORMATION FOR NATO

NATO, an alliance that has struggled to find its way over the past decade, has quickly come to realize that the alliance must transform in order to maintain relevance. NATO's relevance has been challenged numerous times since the end of the Cold War, altering NATO's primary task to adapt its political and military structure to new threats while continuing to deal with the changing landscape of the former Warsaw Pact nations.[13] This changing landscape includes the demand of peacekeeping in the Balkans and working toward inclusion of new states into the alliance.[14]

NATO's transformation is inextricably linked to that of the U.S. and to maintaining security within the European Theater. The emergence of new challenges, in peace keeping, peace making, stability and combat operations have driven the need for NATO's transformation. To meet these challenges NATO has embarked on efforts to reduce force structure and increase its flexibility and mobility. This new direction for NATO is shaping the definition of transformation of the alliance. This transformation includes a shift from a realist military based alliance designed to defeat a single threat to one designed to provide security and manage instability against new asymmetric threats, both within and outside the European confines of the alliance.[15] To NATO's credit, its adaptation to the end of the Cold War was fundamental, monumental and appropriate;

it finally and formally recognized that its traditional threat was gone. The alliance moved from the static/active defense concepts of the prior decades toward a strategic concept that emphasized security missions outside of traditional NATO areas, and it stressed the importance of developing new capabilities to meet new threats.

In 1991 NATO jettisoned its Cold War strategy and began to open up to the former Warsaw Pact nations with the creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. From 1993 to 1994 NATO saw a need to speed up reform and established the Partnership for Peace (PFP) to further integrate Central and Eastern European Nations. PFP also paved the way for revolutionizing the concept of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF). In 1996, the deployment to Bosnia tested Europe and NATO's resolve and led the way to further improvements of the CJTF concept, to include the creation of another program of integration and cooperation called the European Security and Defense Initiative (ESDI).[16]

Furthermore, continued operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan have accelerated the concept that NATO's military relevancy lies, not in the ability to provide heavy land forces or tactical fighter planes in defense of NATO territory, but rather in the ability to act quickly to stabilize distant situations which, left untended, could expand out into a larger conflict.   Political, social and economic chaos is the new perceived enemy of the West. This changed environment requires new tools: better intelligence, quicker force generation, greater power projection, and more precise weaponry.

These historic initiatives have framed the transformation process for NATO and led to further transformational initiatives established during the Prague Summit of 2002. At Prague, the leaders of NATO agreed to embark on an aggressive agenda to transform the alliance in order to meet the challenges brought on by the asymmetric threat of terrorism and the proliferation of WMD. The nineteen article Prague Summit declaration established the new framework for transformation framed by three key principles- the streamlining of the NATO command structure and establishment of the Allied Command for Transformation, formerly Strategic Allied Command Atlantic (SACLANT); the creation of the NATO Response Force; and the improvement and development of military capabilities.[17] The essence of this sweeping document is found in Articles 4, 5, 7, and 14.

Article 4: Upon decision by the North Atlantic Council, NATO must be able to field forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed, to sustain operations over distance and time, including in an environment where they might be faced with nuclear, biological and chemical threats, and to achieve their objectives. NATO decided to:

6

- Create and NATO Response Force with Initial Operational Capability by October 2004 and Full Capability by October 2006.
- Streamline NATO's military command structure. NATO will establish two strategic commands. One focused on operations (Allied Command for Operations (ACO)) and a functional command focused on transformation, (Allied Command for Transformation (ACT)).
- Each member nation has agreed to improve and develop new military capabilities for modern warfare in a high threat environment. Primary focus is on NBC defense, C4ISR, strategic lift, air to air refueling, deployable CS and CSS.
- Endorse the agreed military concept for defense against terrorism.[18]

Article 5: Admittance of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia into NATO.[19]

Article 7: NATO pledges to upgrade cooperation with the European Union through the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the Partnership for Peace (PFP).[20]

Article 14: NATO pledges continued commitment to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan.[21]

Whether out of self preservation or the true need for reform, NATO has steadily implemented each of the articles from the Prague Summit over the past 15 months. The fulfillment of these changes will maintain NATO's relevancy and allow the alliance to face the asymmetric threat of terrorism and defeat it, much like it did in facing the Soviet threat during the Cold War.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC CO-OPERATION COUNCIL AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

One of the most important developments within NATO after the Cold War was the establishment of the North Atlantic Co-Operation Council (NACC). The NACC was designed to allow all European nations, to include non-NATO members, a forum to discuss European issues that may require a NATO response.[22] As the NACC achieved success in promoting dialogue the United States saw a further need to expand NATO's influence and laid the ground work for establishment of the Partnership for Peace (PFP).

PFP has been a benchmark policy for NATO. It provides the mechanism for states not comfortable with full membership to work with NATO members to enhance continental security and allow the ascension of countries interested in NATO membership without fully committing to Article 5 responsibilities.[23] The 55 countries involved in PFP are offered the opportunity for cooperation in many different fields. Activities range from military exercises, workshops, and

leadership seminars.   Each country is expected to provide military support in relationship to its capabilities with the promise to improve military capabilities as it progresses towards full alliance membership. The successes in Kosovo and Bosnia are directly related to the spirit of cooperation and experiences of those countries engaged in the PFP process.[24]

PFP remains a continued success for NATO mainly due to the few resources which are needed to enable PFP to function effectively.   Although it has had wide repercussions across Europe, it does not employ a large bureaucracy and does not occupy costly premises. There is a Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) at Mons, Belgium, which coordinates military PFP activities and partner countries also have Diplomatic Missions or Liaison Offices at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. [25]

THE COMBINED JOINT TASK FORCE CONCEPT

In January 1994, NATO leaders approved the initiative to establish a new command and control structure called the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF).   Although the concept of a CJTF was not new it was NATO's first real attempt to transform the old Cold War Alliance headquarters to something that would provide strikingly different capabilities for the future.[26]

The concept was designed to provide NATO with a flexible means to respond to new security challenges, to include operations involving partners outside of the alliance.   The U.S. provided the catalyst for developing the CJTF concept in NATO. The aims were: to adapt NATO's force structure for new missions; to project security and stability towards the east by giving partner states a way to participate with NATO in crisis response; and to support ESDI by offering a military capability to support security or support operations that concern Europe. This would keep the EU from trying to establish a separate military that would compete with and not compliment NATO.[27]

Although the CJTF concept is sound it has not been widely utilized under the auspices of NATO.   Most of the operations undertaken by NATO throughout the 1990's have been led by the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) or under the C2 of the Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corp (ARRC).   As cited by Terrry Terriff, there are several reasons why NATO and especially the U.S. is not apt to fully adopt the CJTF concept. First the existing NATO structure has been streamlined to allow theater command roles to be allocated to major and regional NATO commands. Second SHAPE has already undertaken numerous changes in the wake of IFOR, SFOR and KFOR operations in its ability to generate and sustain operations. Third, utilizing the force commander's current staff provides unity of command with command structures and staffs

that maintain established SOPs and have the ability to train as a team.   Lastly, the standing
SACEUR is unlikely to be willing to relinquish overall operational control of a NATO mission.[28]

For NATO, the concept of a CJTF HQ is not completely without use. The other potential
requirement for a NATO CJTF HQ is to provide a common command structure for purely
European operations in support of ESDI/ESDP obligations. The CJTF HQ may provide the
political means for gaining cooperation of non-alliance European forces when NATO is working
to build a coalition to support operations outside of the confines of Europe.[29]

ESDI AND ESDP

One of the more controversial policies in NATO history has been the implementation of
the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) which has led to the European Security and
Defense Policy (ESDP) for the European Union (EU). ESDI was unofficially launched by the
NAC in January 1994. It was initially designed as a technical military arrangement that would
allow the European side of the alliance to assume a greater share of the security missions, by
giving the Western European Union and eventually the European Union more access to those
NATO assets that it did not possess.[30]   ESDI was also initiated to get alliance members to
improve their military capabilities and promote interoperability among alliance members. ESDP
is the EU policy to establish a EU military capability that would allow the EU to conduct its own
operations outside of NATO.   The EU established a "Headline Goal" for a 60,000 man
European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF) that can deploy in 60 days and be sustained for up to 1
year.   This capability was intended to enable the conduct of effective EU led military operations,
with or without NATO support, and to support NATO operations when required.[31]

Both ESDI and ESDP have been at the center of controversy for NATO for the past 4
years. Most of the critics agree that to allow more European autonomy could possibly cause the
demise of NATO. When initially conceived, the ERRF was focused on peacekeeping and
peacemaking operations so intervention within a 60 day timeframe could be seen as
acceptable. With the advent of the GWOT and WMD proliferation this timeline is not likely to be
responsive enough.[32] The current NATO Allied Rapid Reaction Force can deploy in less time
with practically the same capability and the NRF, a work in progress, will be even more
responsive and more lethal.

ESDP is seen by some as a political football that is clearly promoting EU autonomy and is
an attempt to subvert U.S. leadership. This is certainly not true. ESDP is a part of EU Common
Foreign and Security Policy that outlines a EU military capability to project power. It is not in

9

competition with NATO but is designed to compliment NATO capability and promote interoperability.

Another area seen as contentious is EU access to NATO military planning capabilities and intelligence assets. Most of the debate is focused the EU committing to a military action which requires the use of NATO military force or a capability. The fear is that the EU will require a separate command and control structure to plan operations that may detract from NATO capabilities. NATO has currently endorsed a plan for the EU to share NATO planning mechanisms, primarily operational planning at SHAPE, and adopt the NATO force planning process. This will avoid redundancy and allow the EU to take advantage of NATO expertise. Even with the current issues, ESDP is fully supported throughout NATO. The big test for ESDP and the EU will be how well the EU handles peacekeeping duties in Bosnia and Macedonia.

It is clear that NATO has seen the need for transformation since the end of the Cold War. The implemented policy initiatives have attributed to the success of the alliance in its support of operations in Bosnia, Macedonia, Kosovo, and most recently Afghanistan. As NATO continues to look toward the future and implement the initiatives outlined in the Prague Summit, it must remember to continue to support those policies that continue to remain viable, such as PFP, and continue to work with the EU within the construct of ESDP and Berlin Plus.

NATO'S ROLE IN DEFEATING TERRORISM

> The Core of NATO's vision for the 21st Century is deceptively simple. NATO embodies the transatlantic link between North America and Europe, the most successful alliance in history. As President Truman said when the Washington Treaty was signed, NATO safeguard's the peace and prosperity of our community of Nations. September 11th has reinforced that purpose. NATO's core business, of defending the homelands of its members from attack is as important now as at any time since 1949. In this unpredictable and interconnected world, we all need alliances and partnerships to ensure our defense and security.
>
> —Speech by Lord Robertson November 2003

Immediately following the tragedy of 11 September, NATO invoked Article 5 of the Treaty. Article 5 states that "and armed attack against on or more of the NATO members shall be considered as an attack against them all." This move by NATO was more than a symbolic gesture to show support to the United States. It served as the catalyst for NATO to enter the fight against terror.[33]

The entire world changed dramatically after September 11 and NATO responded in kind to the increased asymmetric threat of terrorism. Although NATO was not initially called upon to participate in operations in Afghanistan, the support provided by NATO was critical to U.S. success.   After invoking Article 5, NATO leaders agreed to immediately offer support in response to requests by the United States. NATO responded by offering both political support and military support through a series of measures which expanded the options of the United States in dealing with Al Qaeda.   These measures included improved intelligence sharing, blanket over flight rights for United States and other Allied aircraft, critical aerial refuel support to initial deploying forces in support of OIF, and coordination for basing support.

NATO's greatest contribution to GWOT began on 11 August 2003, when NATO took over command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) along with all coordination and planning efforts. Although NATO trained forces where providing a significant amount of support to GWOT, the assumption of command over ISAF gave NATO its first operation outside the Euro-Atlantic area and has been critical to restoring some of the relevancy to the alliance. By accepting this mission the U.S. has been allowed to focus on the GWOT in the region and has possibly freed forces to support operations in Iraq.   In addition, the presence of ISAF has helped to ensure ratification of a new Afghan Constitution. Yet as the new NATO Secretary General (Mr. de Hoop Scheffer) pointed out in a recent speech, "We have work to do in Afghanistan. To succeed, Afghanistan needs more support. More Provincial Reconstruction Teams [PRTs] need to be deployed into the provinces. ISAF and the PRTs must receive all the equipment and personnel they need to do to job."[34] This has led NATO on a quest to expand the ISAF mission and accept a greater role in the reconstruction effort.

Although not always in the lime light, NATO has contributed a significant amount of support to the GWOT.   The United States needs to recognize how critical this alliance is to defeating the threat of terrorism and work to give NATO a lead role if the free and democratic nations of the world are to rid themselves of terrorism.

Even though the United States has provided the greater share of leadership and military might in the current fight, it cannot continue to maintain the current effort in Iraq and other theaters without degrading military readiness. With over one third of the US military committed in Iraq and Afghanistan there is little left to help defend the homeland and other theaters. This alone justifies the requirement for the Administration to develop a strategy that allows NATO a greater role in the prosecution of GWOT.

A RECIPE FOR CHANGE/ SUMMARY AND THE RISKS

NATO must transform a military that won the Cold War into a modern, flexible, highly trained force that can deploy anywhere it's needed. Transformation means more than just purchasing new technologies or new systems or new platforms. It means changing the way NATO thinks and plans. It means changes to organization and culture by adopting new structures, improving training methods, adapting doctrine and educating leaders. The Prague Summit has laid the groundwork for NATO transformation and the establishment of the ACT will give NATO the ability to achieve transformation in concert with its most modernized member. In addition the establishment of the NRF will give NATO a force capable of rapidly responding to the new asymmetric threats facing the free world today and in the future.

While NATO's contribution to the fight against terrorism has already been significant, efforts are underway to better equip the Alliance and to allow it to play its full part in the long-term effort.

For the U.S. the gains for allowing NATO a greater role in the war on terror far outweigh the risk. The U.S. is already struggling financially in supporting this war unilaterally. American taxpayers will not allow the administration to raise taxes or continue to support funding reconstruction efforts in Iraq and other areas for very long. The U.S. needs NATO to offset the cost of this war and provide the forces to give our own military a chance to reconstitute and refocus.

While the United States is the world's sole remaining superpower, it cannot solve all problems on its own. Moreover, many of the challenges the United States faces—especially the war on terrorism—require cooperation with America's European allies and other partners on a broad range of issues that extend beyond the military realm. Hence, NATO will remain an essential forum for coordinating Euro-Atlantic strategic cooperation as well as a vehicle for developing the military capabilities to deal with both old and new challenges

NATO needs to use its experience in recent operations to take on the role of a long-term peacekeeping and reconstruction force, and its support to ISAF is a good start. In addition NATO could assume a lead role in the security and reconstruction of Iraq. NATO could also play a major stability role by helping enforce the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Accord and reaching out to Arab Nations as part of the Partnership for Peace.

During the recent NATO conference at Colorado Springs, NATO officials outlined new strategies to turn the alliance into a potent machine for fighting terrorism. The two new proposals or means being discussed where: The creation of a NATO police branch modeled

12

after the Italian Carabinieri.; and empowering NATO with the ability to commit the new NATO Response Force based on certain mission criteria created by the Alliance.

Establishing a NATO multinational military police force would provide a much needed force multiplier when dealing with reconstruction and security issues in operations such as Iraq.[35] The US military police are already stretched thin with no major force to relieve them when transitioning from combat to security and reconstruction operations. Also, by allowing the NATO headquarters to commit forces without going through a long and slow voting process the NRF will truly be able to respond as designed.

Finally, the time is now for the United States and NATO to mend any political fences and move toward a strengthening of this storied alliance. Throughout NATO's history the solidarity of the alliance has always been more important than the concern of any single country. Terrorism threatens the entire world and will be a war that requires the cooperation and determination of all freedom loving people. In order for the world to succeed and to protect U.S. interests and preserve our way of life the U.S. must dedicate significant attention to the alliance and support it's transformation into a force capable of winning the Global War on Terrorism.

WORD COUNT= 5,386

ENDNOTES

[1] Hans Binnendijk and Richard Kugler, "Transforming European Forces," *Survival, vol.* 44, no. 3, (Autumn 2002): 121.

[2] Hans Binnendijk and Richard Kugler, "Transforming European Forces," *Survival, vol.* 44, no. 3, (Autumn 2002): 122.

[3] Hans Binnendijk and Richard Kugler, "Transforming European Forces," *Survival, vol.* 44, no. 3, (Autumn 2002): 122.

[4] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[5] Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, "Transformation Planning Guidance." (April 2003).

[6] Admiral E.P. Giambastiani, "What is Transformation? Transformation is a continuing process, not a destination." (Summer 2003). Available from http://www.nato.int/docu/review/ 2003 /issue2/english/art3.html. Internet. Accessed 9 September 2003.

[7] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[8] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[9] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[10] Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, "Transformation Planning Guidance." (April 2003).

[11] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[12] A.K. Cebrowski, *Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach* (Washington, D.C.: Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Fall 2003), 3; available from <http://www.of.osd.mil>. Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

[13] Charles Krupnick, ed., *Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 17.

[14]Charles Krupnick, ed., *Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 17.

[15]Charles Krupnick, ed., *Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 17.

[16]Philip H. Gordon, ed., NATO's *Transformation. The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997), 2.

[17]The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, A Readers Guide, n.p., n.d., 4.

[18] The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, A Readers Guide, n.p., n.d., 72-73.

[19] The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, A Readers Guide, n.p., n.d., 74.

[20] The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, A Readers Guide, n.p., n.d., 75.

[21] The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, A Readers Guide, n.p., n.d., 76.

[22]Clay Clemens, ed., *NATO and the Quest for Post-Cold War Security* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Inc.,1996), 40.

[23] Clay Clemens, ed., *NATO and the Quest for Post-Cold War Security* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Inc.,1996), 41.

[24] "Understanding NATO," available from http://www.expandnato.org/ undernato.html; Internet; accessed 18 December 2003.

[25] NATO Issues, "Update of Afghanistan," 19 August 2003; available from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/ index.htm; Internet; accessed 12 October 2003.

[26]Philip H. Gordon, ed., NATO's *Transformation. The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997), 203.

[27]Philip H. Gordon, ed., NATO's *Transformation. The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997), 205.

[28]Jolyon Howorth, John T.S. Keeler, and Terry Terriff, eds., Defending *Europe. The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy* (New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003), 42-43.

[29]Jolyon Howorth, John T.S. Keeler, and Terry Terriff, eds., Defending *Europe. The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy* (New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003), 42-43.

[30]Jolyon Howorth, John T.S. Keeler, and Terry Terriff, eds., Defending *Europe. The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy* (New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003), 8.

[31]Jolyon Howorth, John T.S. Keeler, and Terry Terriff, eds., Defending *Europe. The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy* (New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003), 10.

[32] Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, "NATO: A bruised alliance marches on," 29 January 2004; available from http://www.iht.com/cgi-bin/ generic.cgi?template+articleprint.tmplh& ArticleId+127171; Internet; accessed 6 February 2004.

[33]NATO Issues, "September 11 – One year on NATO's contribution to the fight against terrorism," 19 August 2003; available from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/ index.htm; Internet; accessed 12 October 2003.

[34]NATO Issues, "Update of Afghanistan," 19 August 2003; available from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/ index.htm; Internet; accessed 12 October 2003.

[35]Doug Berenter, Defense News, "Consider a Constabulary," 10 November 2003; available from http://www.Nato-pa.int/default.asp?shortcuts=464; Internet; accessed 29 February 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Asmus D. "Rebuilding the Atlantic Alliance" Foreign Affairs (September/October 2003):1-6. Database on-line. Available from Lexis-Nexis. Accessed 14 October 2003.

Asmus, Ronald D. "Rebuilding the Atlantic Alliance," Foreign Affairs, September/October 2003. Available from <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/ 20030901faessay82502/ronald-d-asmus/ rebuilding-the-atlantic-alliance.html>. Internet. Accessed 14 October 2003.

Asmus, Ronald D. and Charles Grant, Debate. "Can NATO remain an effective military and political alliance if it keeps growing?" Available from www.NATO.org. Internet. Accessed 12 December 2003.

Binnendijk, Hans, and Richard Kugler. "Transforming European Forces." Survival; (Autumn 2002): 44, 3; Military Module pg. 117.

Berenter, Doug. Defense News. "Consider a Constabulary." 10 November 2003. Available from http://www.Nato-pa.int/default.asp?shortcuts=464. Internet. Accessed 29 February 2004.

Bush, George W. "National Security Strategy for Combating Terrorism" (Washington D.C.: The White House, February 2003). 32.

Calleo, David P. Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of the Western Alliance. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987.

Cebrowski, A.K. Military Transformation. A Strategic Approach. Director, Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense. Pentagon, Washington, D.C., Fall 2003. Internet. Available from www.of.osd.mil.

Clark, Wesley K. "The United States and NATO: The Way Ahead." Parameters (Winter 1999-2000): 2-14.

Clemens, Clay, ed. NATO and the Quest for Post-Cold War Security. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Inc.,1996.

Cooper, Mary H., "Future of NATO", CQ Researcher, (February 28, 2003): 1-32.

De Hoop Scheffer, Jaap. "NATO: A bruised alliance marches on." 29 January 2004. Available from http://www.iht.com/cgi-bin/ generic.cgi?template+articleprint.tmplh&ArticleId+127171. Internet. Accessed 6 February 2004.

Donnelly, Tom, "Rethinking NATO", NATO Review Issue no. 2 (2003): 1-4.

Fischer, Joachim Colonel, "NATO's dual challenge at the start of the 21st Century." Strategic Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 03 March 2000.

Garamone, Jim. "New NATO Transformation Command Established in Norfolk," Pentagon Brief, Portsmouth, 15 July 2003. Available from <http://proquest.umi.com/qdweb?index=0&did=000000372738111&SrchMode=. Internet. Accessed 11 September 2003.

Garden, Sir Timothy, "Rebuilding Relationships", NATO Review Issue no. 2 (2003): 1-4.

Giambastiani, Admiral E.P. NATO Review. "What is Transformation? Transformation is a continuing process, not a destination." (Summer 2003): Available from <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003 /issue2/english/art3.html>; Internet. Accessed 9 September 2003.

Gordon, Philip H., ed. NATO's Transformation. The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997.

Great Decisions Guides: NATO. "In Focus." Available from <http://www.fpa.org/ newsletter_info2432/newsletter_info.htm>. Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Howorth, Jolyon and John T.S. Keeler, Terry Terriff. Defending Europe. The EU, NATO and the Quest for European Autonomy. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003.

Hughes, David. Aviation Week & Space Technology. "NATO Transformation U.S., Canadian, French military officials agree NATO must change, but funding is limited." 20 October 2003. Available from <http://proquest.umi.com /pqdweb?index=0&did =000000429365381 &SrchMode=1&sid=2… Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003

Hulsman, John, Ph.D., Jack Spencer, James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., and Will Schirano. "Secretary Powell's Message to Europe: Measuring NAO's Future Performance." 12 November 2003. Available from www.heritage.org. Internet. Accessed 6 February 2004.

Hunter, Robert E. NATO: The Next Generation. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 1984.

Hunter, Robert E. "The Perfect Army for Iraq: NATO." RAND Corporation, 13 September 2003. Available from http://www.rand.org /commentary/ 091303NYT.html. Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Jane's Defense Weekly. "NATO Moves To Transform Forces and Capabilities." 29 January 2003. Available from <http://delphi-s.dia.smil.mil/admin /EARLYBIRD /030127/s20030217149147.html>; Internet. Accessed 6 January 2004.

Johnson, Rebecca and Michael Zenko. "All Dressed Up and No Place to Go: Why NATO Should Be on the Front Lines in the War on Terror," Parameters, (Winter 2002-03): 48-63.

Kay, Sean. NATO and the Future of European Security. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998.

Keeter, Hunter, "NATO Response Force Key To Alliance Transformation."29 April, 2003. Available from http://delphi-s.dia.smil.mil/admin /EARLYBIRD /030429/s20030429180859.htm;. Internet . Accessed 6 January 2004.

Krupnick, Charles, ed. Almost NATO. Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Laid, Robbin F. The Europeanization of the Alliance. Westview Press, Inc., 1991.

Mariano, Stephen J. and Brendan Wilson. "NATO Response Force: Political Deftness, Economic Efficiency and Military Power." Center for Contemporary Conflict. 1 April 2003. Available from <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/rsepResources/ si/apr03/europe.asp.> Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Naumann, General Klaus. "NATO in a Changing Europe." Available from http://www.csdr.org/96Boof/Naumann.htm. Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

NATO International Military Staff. "NATO's Command Structure: The Old and the New," 10 October 2003. Available from <http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/command-structure.htm>. Internet. Accessed 12 October 2003.

NATO Issues. "NATO and the Scourge of Terrorism." 19 August 2003. Available from <http://www.nato.int/terrorism/index.htm>. Internet. Accessed 10 December 2003.

NATO Issues. "September 11 – One year on NATO's contribution to the fight against terrorism." 19 August 2003. Available from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/ index.htm. Internet. Accessed 12 October 2003.

NATO Issues. "Update of Afghanistan." 19 August 2003. Available from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/ index.htm. Internet. Accessed 12 October 2003.NATO Review. "In the Wake of Iraq. Rethinking NATO." Summer 2003. Available from <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003 /issue2/english/art2.html>. Internet. Accessed 29 September 2003.

NATO Review. "In the Wake of Iraq. The Road to Kabul." Summer 2003. Available from <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003 /issue2/english/art3.html>. Internet. Accessed 9 September 2003.

NATO Response Force Key To Alliance Transformation. "Transforming NATO." Available from <http://delphi-s.dia.smil.mil/admin/ EARLYBRD/030429/ s20030429180859.html>. Internet. Accessed 6 January 2004.

NATO Update. Afghanistan's Focus of Secretary General's UK Visit. Available from http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/command-structure.htm. Internet. Accessed 12 February 2004.

NATO Update. NATO Expands its Role in Afghanistan. Available from http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/command-structure.htm. Internet. Accessed 6 January 2004.

Pakistan Daily Times Article, "NATO Eyes Mideast, Africa and new Center of activity" September 30, 2003: 1-4.

Regional Headquarters East Atlantic. Headquarters Allied Naval Forces North. "Overview." Available from http://www.eastlant.nato.int/pfp/background.htm. Internet. Accessed 29 February 2004.

Robertson, Lord, Secretary General to NATO. "Rebalancing NATO for a Strong Future." Defense Week Conference, Brussels, January 31, 2000. Available from <http://www.mkogy.hu/nato/2000/00an02.htm>. Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Robertson, Lord, Secretary General to NATO. "Rebalancing NATO for a Strong Future."
        Defense Week Conference-Brussels, 31 January 2000. Available from
        <http://www.mkogy.hu/nato/2000/00an02.htm>. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Robertson, Lord, Secretary General to NATO. "Speech to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly,"
        M2 Presswire, May 26,2003: 1-2. Available from Google. Accessed 07 October 2003.

Robertson, Lord. "United in common fight against terror." 27 November 2003. Available from
        http://news.scotsman.com/
        print.cfm?id=1307532003&referringtemplate=http%3A%2f%2F. Internet. Accessed 6
        February 2004.

Roeder, Tom, "NATO Mission in State of Flux." The Gazette, Colorado Springs, Colorado,
        October 01, 2003: 1.

Ruiz, Diego A. " The Road to Kabul" NATO Review. (Summer 2003): 1-5. Available from Lexis-
        Nexis. Accessed 14 October 2003.

Rumsfeld, Donald H., Secretary of Defense. Transformation Planning Guidance. April 2003.

Sands, David R. "NATO Chief Recommends Iraq Deployment: But Afghan mission comes first."
        The Washington Times, 18 December 2003. Available from
        <http://ebird.afis.osd.mil/ebfiles/e2003121824808.html>. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Squitieri, Tom. "NATO Could Change Process for Deploying Troops." USA Today, 13 October
        2003. 1-12.

"The Defense Monitor." 2000 Center for Defense Information, Washington, D.C.

The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation. A Reader's Guide.

Transformation of the Alliance. "U.S. Support for ESDI." Available from
        <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/books/Books%20-%201997/
        Allied%20Command%20Structures.> Internet. Accessed 18 December 2003.

Treverton, Gregory F. Making the Alliance Work: The United States and Western Europe.
        Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.

"Understanding NATO." Available from <http://www.expandnato.org/ undernato.html>. Internet.
        Accessed 18 December 2003.